Case 1:13-cr-00811-ALC Document 291 Filed 07/14/15 Page 1 of 14

F68PARAS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 V. 13 CR 811 (ALC) 5 EDWIN ARAUJO, 6 Defendant. 7 ----x 8 New York, N.Y. June 8, 2015 9 2:07 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. ANDREW L. CARTER, JR., 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 PREET BHARARA, United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York 17 JASON MASIMORE Assistant United States Attorney 18 WILLIAM STAMPUR 19 Attorney for Defendant 20 ALSO PRESENT: LYVIA RAMOS, USPO 21 ELIZA LEHNER, Inter with AUSA 22 23 24 25

1 (In open court)

(Case called)

MR. MASIMORE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Jason

Masimore for the government, and with me at counsel's table,

with the Court's permission, Eliza Lehner, an intern with our

office.

MR. STAMPUR: William J. Stampur for Mr. Araujo. Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Mr. Araujo.

MR. STAMPUR: May I be seated, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes. Okay. We're here today to impose sentencing in the case of United States v. Edwin Araujo. In preparation for today's proceeding, I've reviewed the presentence report, a submission by defense counsel, and a submission by the government. Is there anything else that I should have?

MR. MASIMORE: Not from the government.

MR. STAMPUR: Well, Judge, there is one thing, and I can hand it up to the Court. My client just gave me this, and I can give it to the assistant. It's a work performance rating from the Federal Bureau of Prisons that he just got and it covers the period of October 2014 to the present. Your Honor may be somewhat familiar with these forms, but I did just show it to the assistant. I literally just got it. So if I may

1	just hand it up to the Court.
2	THE COURT: Yes. Just one moment.
3	(Pause)
4	THE COURT: Okay. I've reviewed this. Does counsel
5	want this back? Do you want me to keep this?
6	MR. STAMPUR: You can keep it, Judge, as part of my
7	submission, if you don't mind.
8	THE COURT: Government have any position on this?
9	MR. STAMPUR: I guess maybe I can take it back, make a
10	copy of it and then give a copy to you. Would that be fine?
11	THE COURT: That's fine. Because we, obviously, have
12	this as part of the record, and it probably makes sense to
13	MR. MASIMORE: I was just going to suggest perhaps
14	after the proceeding, if counsel wanted to ECF it, then it
15	would become part of the record as a supplemental.
16	THE COURT: Okay. Let's do that. Just give it back.
17	MR. MASIMORE: Just noting that redaction, if you
18	will.
19	THE COURT: Just one moment.
20	(Pause)
21	Okay. Is there anything else that I should have from
22	either side?
23	MR. STAMPUR: I think not, Judge.
24	THE COURT: Okay. To the extent that I did not
25	already do this, I believe I did, I will accept Mr. Araujo's

plea of guilty. Let me just ask some questions of defense counsel and Mr. Araujo and the government. Counsel, have you read and reviewed the presentence report and discussed it with your client?

MR. STAMPUR: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Araujo, have you had an opportunity to read the presentence report and discuss it with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Counsel for the government, have you had an opportunity to read and review the presentence report?

MR. MASIMORE: I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are there any objections to anything in the presentence report from either side?

MR. MASIMORE: Not from the government, your Honor.

MR. STAMPUR: Well, your Honor, on Page 4 of my submission I asked the Court to delete from his PSR his name from a certain paragraphs, 16, 17, 31, 32 and 33, and the reason for that request is that Mr. Araujo suggests that he wasn't present for those alleged burglaries. I've discussed that with Mr. Masimore. He's definitely, if I may have a second, agreed with me with respect to paragraph 31. Right, Jason? May I have a moment? Do you want to speak about it? (Pause)

Shall I continue, your Honor? So after having spoken

with Mr. Masimore, I think the first paragraph there's definitely no objection to deleting his name. It is paragraph 31, Mr. Masimore?

MR. MASIMORE: Correct.

MR. STAMPUR: Shall I continue?

THE COURT: Yes, go ahead. I thought you were continuing.

MR. STAMPUR: I'm sorry. I apologize. And with respect to the other four paragraphs that I asked the Court to remove my client's name, the government has indicated to me that he may not have been physically present, but I guess the government can speak for themselves. They're suggesting that there still was a connection to those burglaries. Would that be a fair statement, Mr. Masimore?

MR. MASIMORE: Yes, your Honor. With respect to the other burglaries, the evidence would show that Mr. Araujo was present or participating in these burglaries to a preponderance of the evidence, for purposes of sentencing, relate to cell phone records. I think if the Court looks at paragraphs 32 and 33 --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MASIMORE: -- in particular, those are burglaries that happened in Queens and in Brooklyn, which are -- you know, these happened at odd times, that being late at night or very early in the morning. And our cell phone data from this case

showed the presence of phones belonging to Edwin Araujo and the others at these burglaries at these times.

These burglaries were nowhere near Mr. Araujo's apartment at the time, and so we have no basis to, from our perspective, agree to take his name out. It's our understanding, just like all of the other burglaries, that Mr. Araujo participated in these. So I'm not sure what we're left with.

I think the overarching principle, I don't think the defense quarrels with and that may be the more fruitful area of discussions, and that is this defendant participated in a large number of burglaries all over the city. And so whether he participated in the burglaries in paragraphs 16, 17, 32 and 33 specifically, I think we certainly are in agreement, and I will let defense counsel speak to this, obviously, that he did participate in a large number of burglaries throughout the course of the scheme.

THE COURT: What exactly is defense counsel's position regarding these other paragraphs here? Is it your position that his name should be deleted because he's not responsible for those burglaries, or that he simply wasn't present?

MR. STAMPUR: Both. Both responsibility and present.

I'm not here to ask for a Fatico hearing. He and I have

discussed this. So I understand the government's position. So

if we're just deleting paragraph 31, which I guess we're in a

hundred percent agreement concerning, we can note for the record what I just stated. We're not -- I've had this discussion with Mr. Araujo.

THE COURT: Well, how does that affect the guideline calculation?

MR. STAMPUR: It doesn't, Judge, and I've had that discussion with Mr. Araujo. He wanted to be as specific as possible in his review of everything that has been given to him. So it doesn't affect the guidelines. I'd love to continue with the sentence, but I just want to go on the record, per his request, in the courtroom, if that's okay with the Court.

THE COURT: We may need to have a hearing, I suppose. I certainly would need some other information on this because it certainly affects things. I need to know specifically which of these burglaries he was involved in. It would certainly help to know that and, again, this is a person's life that we're dealing with. These are crimes to business owners, and we have to be as specific as possible with that.

So there are specific dates set forth in the presentence report. I wasn't sure from reading defense counsel's submission, where you just simply said that you wanted them deleted, I didn't know what you meant. Now, it seems that what you're saying is that he is not responsible, didn't participate in these burglaries or any conspiracy

2

3

regarding these burglaries on those specific dates for the burglaries listed in paragraphs 16, 17, 31, 32 and 33. Is that your position.

4

MR. STAMPUR: Well, 31, the government agrees with; so there are four remaining. Can I have a moment?

5 6

THE COURT: Yes.

7

(Pause)

8

9

MR. STAMPUR: Your Honor, my client has indicated, having spoken with me, that we'll withdraw the application with respect to the other four paragraphs, 16, 17, 32 and 33.

11

12

13

10

THE COURT: Well, it certainly would be helpful, I think, for me to have a clear idea regarding, again, which burglaries he's responsible for and/or participated in.

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

concerned about in this case. Mr. Araujo, in his letter to the Court, indicated that he understands that deterrence is one of the things that I am concerned about, and I am concerned about that. According to the presentence report, for his prior felony conviction, he was released on parole on January 21st, The burglary listed in paragraph 16 took place on January 27th, 2011, and that is certainly something that would give me some pause if, in fact, he is present for that burglary and responsible for that burglary.

Let me let you know one of the things that I'm

It's something that I think I might need to -- since that's being challenged in some way, or was being challenged, I

understand you now wish to withdraw that, but I think, in fairness, that you should know and he should know that the timing of that burglary has me a little bit more concerned than the timings of some of the other burglaries. And, obviously, if there is no objection to some of the other burglaries that took place shortly thereafter, there certainly is mention of a burglary in paragraph 17.

Let me just make sure I have the total list of what the defense was objecting to. 17 is also one of the ones listed by the defense which took place February 25th. I suppose there's no objection to the burglary listed in paragraph 18, which took place on June 15th, which is still less than six months after his release or less than five months after his release from state parole.

But, obviously, it's still bad if he's out on parole and within six months is engaged in this sort of conduct. But there is some increasing concern if he's engaged and present for any burglary that takes place less than a week after his release. I looked on the calendar, and January 21st was a Friday, that other burglary took place on a Thursday, the following Thursday. So that does give me some concern.

So perhaps it makes sense to adjourn sentence, and let defense counsel and his client discuss this further as to whether or not you wish to have a Fatico hearing, or how you want me to consider that, since you've now raised this as an

What's counsel's position on this? 1 issue. 2 MR. STAMPUR: May I have a moment? 3 THE COURT: Yes. 4 (Pause) 5 MR. STAMPUR: Your Honor, I think we'll adjourn the 6 sentence. 7 THE COURT: Okay. All right. How much time do you need, counsel? Counsel, at this point, do you believe that you 8 9 are requesting a hearing? 10 MR. STAMPUR: Why don't we tentatively set it down for 11 a hearing, and if he changes his mind, I'll inform the Court 12 and the government. 13 THE COURT: All right. Just to make sure counsel is 14 aware of what my concern is, my primary concern is whether or 15 not he's responsible for the burglary. I'm not particularly concerned whether he's physically present, but if he's 16 17 participating in that burglary less than a week after his 18 release, then obviously that raises some serious concerns. Whether he's physically present or whether he's communicating 19 20 by telephone or whether he's somehow otherwise conspiring for 21 this burglary to take place, that's what my concern is. 22 So it's not a matter of whether he was physically 23 present, but whether or not he's responsible for that. 24 let's set this down for a hearing. Go ahead, counsel.

MR. MASIMORE: May I have a moment to confer with

25

Mr. Stampur about scheduling?

THE COURT: Sure.

(Pause)

MR. MASIMORE: Your Honor, having consulted with Mr. Stampur about scheduling issues and what it might take to have the government's evidence presentation at such a hearing, I would ask that the Court entertain a date in early, very early September.

MR. STAMPUR: I have no objection to that.

MR. MASIMORE: That being said, if we, through our discussions, have a resolution that happens short of that or earlier than that, we can certainly write to the Court, if that would please the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. That is certainly fine. We can do that. I do note that there seem to be several people here in the audience. I don't know if these people are here for Mr. Araujo, and if they are, give me a sense of who these people are.

While I am required to determine the guideline range that applies to this case, I am no longer required to sentence him within that guideline range. I am cognizant of the fact that there may be family members and friends who may have taken off from work or school to otherwise be here today, who may not be able to be here on the September date.

We will find a date, but it seems to me that it may

make sense -- again, I will give counsel an opportunity to call one of those family members, if you like, and it may make sense to do that today so that we have that for the record. But what's counsel's preference on that?

MR. STAMPUR: Well, first thing I can do is I can provide the Court with a list and their relationships to my client. The majority of the people came in a little bit after the proceedings started; so my original plan was to have names and relationships prepared in front of me. I don't have it right now because people came in, as I said, after this proceeding started. I know most of the people here I know from the past and the family, but some are friends who I never met before.

As far as the second question, I don't have a response as to if there's one person, as opposed to anyone else, who is prepared to address the Court. I think the majority of the people would probably be able to come back in September. Would that be a fair statement? So I don't think that will be of any concern.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's get a date, then, in September.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Friday, September the 4th at 10:00 a.m.

THE COURT: Is that the Friday before Labor Day?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: I'm sorry, it is.

1 MR. STAMPUR: How is the following week, either the 9th or 10th? 2 3 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Thursday, September 10th at 4 10:00 a.m.? 5 MR. STAMPUR: That's fine. 6 THE COURT: All right. Does that work for everyone? 7 MR. MASIMORE: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. So we'll put that down for the 8 9 Fatico hearing. Does counsel have an estimate as to how long 10 this hearing would take? 11 MR. MASIMORE: Your Honor, I think we should set aside 12 the better part of a day I think to -- I think the government's 13 presentation largely will be based on cell site evidence. So I 14 think to establish a record, I think we need to call somebody 15 to provide testimony to make a record as to how reliable that is and the like. That tends to take a bit of time to explain. 16 17 I think if we set aside a day or maybe three-quarters 18 of a day, that should do it. We'll, obviously, work with 19 Mr. Stampur to see if there are ways that we can streamline the 20 presentation or if there are certain things we can agree about 21 to streamline that. If we are going to do that in advance, 22 perhaps we could get to the Court a more accurate time estimate 23 as we approach. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Do we have time for that, Tara?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, Judge.

25

THE COURT: Okay. Great. Okay. So September 10th at 10:00 a.m.; is that the time, Tara? THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes, Judge. THE COURT: All right. So we'll adjourn the sentence for that hearing. Anything else from the government today? MR. MASIMORE: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Anything else from the defense? MR. STAMPUR: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Have a good day. MR. MASIMORE: Thanks, Judge. (Adjourned)